

VOLUME XV.
THE LOUISVILLE
DAILY DEMOCRAT,
—THE—
DOLLAR DEMOCRAT
—AND—
WEEKLY DEMOCRAT
DAILY DEMOCRAT.....\$2.00
DAILY DEMOCRAT to the Country.....5.00
THE DOLLAR DEMOCRAT.....2.00
THE WEEKLY DEMOCRAT.....2.00

The several issues of the DEMOCRAT are edited and published by JOHN H. HANCOCK and W. E. HUGHES, employ a corps of Assistants, Reporters, and Correspondents; and it shall be the earnest endeavor of the proprietors to render the paper acceptable to all classes of readers, by making its columns the medium of every description of news—local, general, and miscellaneous—together with everything of interest in all the departments of trade or business.

The DEMOCRAT was commenced, under the auspices of the Democracy of Louisville, in July, 1844, and it has earnestly and consistently advocated the great truths of that party through its entire history—compromising nothing and yielding nothing to any of the numerous factions that have within that period presented themselves against it. The WEEKLY DEMOCRAT attained a circulation in 1856 never before equalled in the Democratic party south of the Ohio river, west of the Mountains; and our DAILY finds its way through the various mails to almost every point within the reach of daily communication with our city. We intend more than ever to make it acceptable, not only to the friends of "Popular Sovereignty" and "Equal Rights," but to every intelligent and every class of readers. Its correspondence is a decided feature, and furnishes a large amount of news and other important matter which otherwise we could not obtain. Every question, political or otherwise, of general interest, is thoroughly discussed in our Editorial Columns, and nothing of moment shall escape our readers. Besides the Paper will, at all times, embrace a full variety of "READING FOR THE MILLION," consisting of Poetry, original and selected Sketches, Miscellany, and a FULL VARIETY designed to meet every taste.

The Daily Democrat will contain an epitome of all that is going on in the city and country, of local or general interest, and will furnish a daily summary, gleaned from the press, gathered from the city, and received by telegraph from all the leading points. It gives daily statements of the market in leading articles, and once every week furnishes a careful and complete review of the market.

It will also furnish in its business columns the advertisements of the most energetic merchants, manufacturers, and tradesmen of Louisville, together with such notices as we shall from time to time make of them. In every essential we intend to adapt the DAILY DEMOCRAT to the wants of the city and its inhabitants. Its business columns shall give a correct impression of the general character of trade in Louisville; and we shall at all times keep our readers thoroughly posted in the events of the commercial world.

The Dollar Democrat is made up from a selection of matter, and transferred to its pages from the columns of our DAILY. It is published every Saturday, at one dollar per year, always in advance. One of fifty subscribers, to one address, twenty cents each.

The Louisville Weekly Democrat is the largest and most complete paper in the Democratic party in the West. In its ample columns we design to keep our readers thoroughly posted in politics, the news, and in all matters of agricultural and mechanical interest, the commerce of the country, and a full variety of miscellaneous reading for the heterogeneous public. In all respects it shall be to its readers a welcome visitor and a useful companion. To Clubs it is sent as follows:

For 1 copy one year, in advance.....\$2.00
For 6 copies, do, do, do.....10.00
For 12 copies, do, do, do.....20.00
For 24 copies, do, do, do.....40.00
A single copy of the Weekly Democrat will be sent to any post-office, where there are no subscribers, at 25 cts. in advance.

It is needless for us to say that the "DEMOCRAT" will continue in politics as heretofore. Democratic. Since the issue of its first number it has continued to do battle against the combined powers of the opposition—under the lead of whatever party it presented itself. It will always maintain the doctrine of States Rights and Popular Sovereignty as essential features of our free institutions; and, as faithful sentinels, we shall warn our friends of the approach of the enemy under whatever flag it is marshalled for the contest.

The great political battle of 1860 will bring together in solid column the friends of the South, of the Union, and of Equal Rights—the advocates of POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY against the conglomerate mass of Abolitionists and Democrats in the North, who are preaching negro equality, and opposing the extension of slave territory and the admission of slave States.

Let our friends throughout the South and the Union come to our support, and aid us in extending the circulation, until the Democrat shall penetrate to every household where the liberties of the people are respected, and the rights of Popular Sovereignty maintained.

HARNEY, HUGHES & CO.
To Business Men Generally.

Those who have established themselves successfully in business should advertise to retain that position.

Those who are but commencing business should advertise to successfully establish themselves.

Discreet and judicious advertising is the very life of business. Those who neglect to avail themselves of its advantages injure themselves and trade, and consequently bestow the reward on others who advertise.

WILL W. & SELEY HARNEY,
Attorneys and Counsellors at Law,
OFFICE NO. 5 COURT PLACE,
LOUISVILLE, KY.

WE ARE NOW PREPARED TO make collections in all parts of the South and West, through our agents, with additional expense and promptness than can be obtained elsewhere.

Brown & Gray
EXCHANGE AND BANKING OFFICE,
No. 40 Main Street, between Third and Fourth,
LOUISVILLE, KY.

WILLIAM M. HITE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
LOUISVILLE, KY.
Office on Main Street, between Fifth and Sixth—No. 45.

COLLECTIONS MADE IN ANY part of the State, through agents established for the purpose.

A. H. M'KAY,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
OFFICE ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF
3rd Street, between 3rd and 4th—No. 100.

JUDGE MUIR'S DECISION
In the Jailor Case.

THOMAS BAYMAN vs. JUDGE CARROLL, et al., Application for Habeas Corpus.

These causes were, by consent of parties, heard together. The facts were mainly agreed, and are substantially as follows, to-wit: On the second day of August, 1858, the judges were held for the offices of County Judge, County Clerk, Sheriff, Coroner, and Jailor. The former incumbents were the Hon. Thomas B. Bayman, John H. Hancock, and Richard Phillips, were candidates for the office of Jailor. The poll-books that Bayman received, 3,644 votes, that Hancock received 343 votes, and that Phillips received 53 votes. These numbers include the votes set down upon several pages of the poll-books, which were not signed by the clerk, the clerk, therefore, as directed by the State, if these pages are excluded from the count, then Bayman received 3,214 votes, and Hancock received 3,216. By the first vote of the judges, Bayman was elected, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
Harney, Hughes & Co.

READING MATTER ON EVERY PAGE.

TUESDAY.....NOV. 16, 1858.

The editor of the Journal is much excited about the election of Senators in Indiana. He writes a column and more himself, and then gives the authority of Jack Hale to help him out. We apprehend the editor had better examine the subject, before he undertakes to instruct his readers. He assumes that the Legislature must prescribe by law the mode, time, and place, of electing a United States Senator. This not having been done in Indiana, the election is invalid, the editor thinks. Now, it is not uncommon for the two houses of a State Legislature to pass a joint resolution fixing the time and place, and proceed to the election accordingly, without any law on the subject. All such elections have been invalid, according to the Journal. We have a law on the subject in this State; but our Know-Nothing Senate did not deem it, and the editor of the Journal justified them in this disregard of the law. We believe he told his readers that the law was only directory, and might be observed or not, at the discretion of either house. The editor had, therefore, better look into the subject a little further, and also recollect his own antecedents. He is not bound to be consistent. At any rate, he can't be expected to be so, judging from his past history; but it would look better; unless he avows his change of opinion.

We hold that a law prescribing the time, place, and manner of electing Senators, is proper enough; and, where there is one, it ought to be observed scrupulously; but it is not necessary to a valid election, if uniform practice is to count anything. The States have departed from a strict construction of the federal constitution on this subject; and upon what construction they will settle down at last, it is not easy to foresee. It appears to us that the Senate of the United States has decided opposite ways, in the two last cases that came before that body. Honorable Senators changed their opinions, perhaps, and it is not unlikely they may change again, at the first opportunity. The editor of the Journal cannot blame them for that; considering that he takes the liberty of changing whenever it suits him; and being dogmatic on both sides, holding that nobody can possibly be honest who does not agree with the best opinion he promulgates.

In the case of Harlan, of Iowa, the Senate of the State did not want a Republican elected, and declined to attend the joint convention. In the case of Bright and Fitch, the Senate of the State did not want Democrats elected, and therefore declined to agree to a joint convention, or attend one.

The Senate of the United States condemned the process in Harlan's case, and sustained that in the case of Bright and Fitch.

They were inconsistent; but what of that? The editor of the Journal has no right to find fault. The Senators of the United States had two years to change opinions. The editor changes in an hour; and in the same article, speaking of the Republican Senate of Indiana refusing to go into an election, he says:

"The alleged tergiversation with which the (Republican) charges these Senators, was that they would not permit this newly-invented trick to cheat them out of their constitutional power to elect the electors. This most faithless in fact, matter was first following that they had repeatedly set them by the corrupt Democracy in Indiana and elsewhere."

Before he gets through he says:

"In the present days of the republic, according to the construction of the constitution, a Senate had the right to refuse an election, unless it were allowed a full and equal voice with the House in making the election. This right was initiated and acted upon by some of the States for twenty or thirty years after the adoption of the constitution, and many of the then wisest and purest men thought with Glasgow that such was the true construction. All this rant of Tompkins and Benjamin about the alleged tergiversation of the practice is a mere hypocritical sham, gotten up to cover the cowardly and mean motives of their own conduct, in speaking as they have done and voting to retain the privilege of having two Democratic Senators kept in their seats, in such plain violation of the constitution."

So these Senators of Iowa and Indiana had a constitutional discretion; yet the corrupt Democracy had set bad examples. If they have this constitutional discretion, then the motive being good or bad, is a matter for individual Senators. If they believe that evils of great magnitude will result from the election of a particular man to the Senate, they are justifiable to use a constitutional discretion to prevent it. It may be a high mark in favor of a man.

We have waited to see if the fire-eating press would tolerate Senator Hammond, of South Carolina. Nobody has said such wicked things of Leconte; no one has given it as contemptuous a "kick," as is not Hammond an Abolitionist? Must he not be read out of the party? Shall Douglas excite all the virulent insinuations of patriots, and will they place before the Senate from South Carolina? We do not think the patriots should make him of an inch of earth; it might lead to the suspicion that their pick was giving way, or that they never had much. So far, instead of denouncing the sinner in suitable terms, he is actually applauded. This is shocking. Even the Washington Union is silent. What has become of the fires of patriotism that blazed so against Douglas, and threatened to burn up all opposition? Are they extinct? What is to become of the country?

The question, "Ought Kansas to have come into the Union under the Leconte constitution?" was debated before the Debating Association of the Law Department of the Louisville University, at R. H. Wagner's, of Davis county, in the affirmative, and Robert Hamilton, of Louisville, in the negative. Mr. Higby, of Missouri, decided the question in the affirmative.

The people of Kansas, who are alone competent to decide in this case, have decided in the negative. It is too late after their decision to take the affirmative, unless we hold that a new State shall come into the Union, whether the people are willing or not.

The Baltimore Clipper, organ of the American party of Baltimore, perpetrates the following good joke:

"The city of New York presents, at this moment, a singular example of the sad effects of Democratic government."

JUDGE MUIR'S DECISION
In the Jailor Case.

THOMAS BAYMAN vs. JUDGE CARROLL, et al., Application for Habeas Corpus.

These causes were, by consent of parties, heard together. The facts were mainly agreed, and are substantially as follows, to-wit: On the second day of August, 1858, the judges were held for the offices of County Judge, County Clerk, Sheriff, Coroner, and Jailor. The former incumbents were the Hon. Thomas B. Bayman, John H. Hancock, and Richard Phillips, were candidates for the office of Jailor. The poll-books that Bayman received, 3,644 votes, that Hancock received 343 votes, and that Phillips received 53 votes. These numbers include the votes set down upon several pages of the poll-books, which were not signed by the clerk, the clerk, therefore, as directed by the State, if these pages are excluded from the count, then Bayman received 3,214 votes, and Hancock received 3,216. By the first vote of the judges, Bayman was elected, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
Harney, Hughes & Co.

READING MATTER ON EVERY PAGE.

TUESDAY.....NOV. 16, 1858.

The editor of the Journal is much excited about the election of Senators in Indiana. He writes a column and more himself, and then gives the authority of Jack Hale to help him out. We apprehend the editor had better examine the subject, before he undertakes to instruct his readers. He assumes that the Legislature must prescribe by law the mode, time, and place, of electing a United States Senator. This not having been done in Indiana, the election is invalid, the editor thinks. Now, it is not uncommon for the two houses of a State Legislature to pass a joint resolution fixing the time and place, and proceed to the election accordingly, without any law on the subject. All such elections have been invalid, according to the Journal. We have a law on the subject in this State; but our Know-Nothing Senate did not deem it, and the editor of the Journal justified them in this disregard of the law. We believe he told his readers that the law was only directory, and might be observed or not, at the discretion of either house. The editor had, therefore, better look into the subject a little further, and also recollect his own antecedents. He is not bound to be consistent. At any rate, he can't be expected to be so, judging from his past history; but it would look better; unless he avows his change of opinion.

We hold that a law prescribing the time, place, and manner of electing Senators, is proper enough; and, where there is one, it ought to be observed scrupulously; but it is not necessary to a valid election, if uniform practice is to count anything. The States have departed from a strict construction of the federal constitution on this subject; and upon what construction they will settle down at last, it is not easy to foresee. It appears to us that the Senate of the United States has decided opposite ways, in the two last cases that came before that body. Honorable Senators changed their opinions, perhaps, and it is not unlikely they may change again, at the first opportunity. The editor of the Journal cannot blame them for that; considering that he takes the liberty of changing whenever it suits him; and being dogmatic on both sides, holding that nobody can possibly be honest who does not agree with the best opinion he promulgates.

In the case of Harlan, of Iowa, the Senate of the State did not want a Republican elected, and declined to attend the joint convention. In the case of Bright and Fitch, the Senate of the State did not want Democrats elected, and therefore declined to agree to a joint convention, or attend one.

The Senate of the United States condemned the process in Harlan's case, and sustained that in the case of Bright and Fitch.

They were inconsistent; but what of that? The editor of the Journal has no right to find fault. The Senators of the United States had two years to change opinions. The editor changes in an hour; and in the same article, speaking of the Republican Senate of Indiana refusing to go into an election, he says:

"The alleged tergiversation with which the (Republican) charges these Senators, was that they would not permit this newly-invented trick to cheat them out of their constitutional power to elect the electors. This most faithless in fact, matter was first following that they had repeatedly set them by the corrupt Democracy in Indiana and elsewhere."

Before he gets through he says:

"In the present days of the republic, according to the construction of the constitution, a Senate had the right to refuse an election, unless it were allowed a full and equal voice with the House in making the election. This right was initiated and acted upon by some of the States for twenty or thirty years after the adoption of the constitution, and many of the then wisest and purest men thought with Glasgow that such was the true construction. All this rant of Tompkins and Benjamin about the alleged tergiversation of the practice is a mere hypocritical sham, gotten up to cover the cowardly and mean motives of their own conduct, in speaking as they have done and voting to retain the privilege of having two Democratic Senators kept in their seats, in such plain violation of the constitution."

So these Senators of Iowa and Indiana had a constitutional discretion; yet the corrupt Democracy had set bad examples. If they have this constitutional discretion, then the motive being good or bad, is a matter for individual Senators. If they believe that evils of great magnitude will result from the election of a particular man to the Senate, they are justifiable to use a constitutional discretion to prevent it. It may be a high mark in favor of a man.

We have waited to see if the fire-eating press would tolerate Senator Hammond, of South Carolina. Nobody has said such wicked things of Leconte; no one has given it as contemptuous a "kick," as is not Hammond an Abolitionist? Must he not be read out of the party? Shall Douglas excite all the virulent insinuations of patriots, and will they place before the Senate from South Carolina? We do not think the patriots should make him of an inch of earth; it might lead to the suspicion that their pick was giving way, or that they never had much. So far, instead of denouncing the sinner in suitable terms, he is actually applauded. This is shocking. Even the Washington Union is silent. What has become of the fires of patriotism that blazed so against Douglas, and threatened to burn up all opposition? Are they extinct? What is to become of the country?

The question, "Ought Kansas to have come into the Union under the Leconte constitution?" was debated before the Debating Association of the Law Department of the Louisville University, at R. H. Wagner's, of Davis county, in the affirmative, and Robert Hamilton, of Louisville, in the negative. Mr. Higby, of Missouri, decided the question in the affirmative.

The people of Kansas, who are alone competent to decide in this case, have decided in the negative. It is too late after their decision to take the affirmative, unless we hold that a new State shall come into the Union, whether the people are willing or not.

The Baltimore Clipper, organ of the American party of Baltimore, perpetrates the following good joke:

"The city of New York presents, at this moment, a singular example of the sad effects of Democratic government."

JUDGE MUIR'S DECISION
In the Jailor Case.

THOMAS BAYMAN vs. JUDGE CARROLL, et al., Application for Habeas Corpus.

These causes were, by consent of parties, heard together. The facts were mainly agreed, and are substantially as follows, to-wit: On the second day of August, 1858, the judges were held for the offices of County Judge, County Clerk, Sheriff, Coroner, and Jailor. The former incumbents were the Hon. Thomas B. Bayman, John H. Hancock, and Richard Phillips, were candidates for the office of Jailor. The poll-books that Bayman received, 3,644 votes, that Hancock received 343 votes, and that Phillips received 53 votes. These numbers include the votes set down upon several pages of the poll-books, which were not signed by the clerk, the clerk, therefore, as directed by the State, if these pages are excluded from the count, then Bayman received 3,214 votes, and Hancock received 3,216. By the first vote of the judges, Bayman was elected, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
Harney, Hughes & Co.

READING MATTER ON EVERY PAGE.

TUESDAY.....NOV. 16, 1858.

The editor of the Journal is much excited about the election of Senators in Indiana. He writes a column and more himself, and then gives the authority of Jack Hale to help him out. We apprehend the editor had better examine the subject, before he undertakes to instruct his readers. He assumes that the Legislature must prescribe by law the mode, time, and place, of electing a United States Senator. This not having been done in Indiana, the election is invalid, the editor thinks. Now, it is not uncommon for the two houses of a State Legislature to pass a joint resolution fixing the time and place, and proceed to the election accordingly, without any law on the subject. All such elections have been invalid, according to the Journal. We have a law on the subject in this State; but our Know-Nothing Senate did not deem it, and the editor of the Journal justified them in this disregard of the law. We believe he told his readers that the law was only directory, and might be observed or not, at the discretion of either house. The editor had, therefore, better look into the subject a little further, and also recollect his own antecedents. He is not bound to be consistent. At any rate, he can't be expected to be so, judging from his past history; but it would look better; unless he avows his change of opinion.

We hold that a law prescribing the time, place, and manner of electing Senators, is proper enough; and, where there is one, it ought to be observed scrupulously; but it is not necessary to a valid election, if uniform practice is to count anything. The States have departed from a strict construction of the federal constitution on this subject; and upon what construction they will settle down at last, it is not easy to foresee. It appears to us that the Senate of the United States has decided opposite ways, in the two last cases that came before that body. Honorable Senators changed their opinions, perhaps, and it is not unlikely they may change again, at the first opportunity. The editor of the Journal cannot blame them for that; considering that he takes the liberty of changing whenever it suits him; and being dogmatic on both sides, holding that nobody can possibly be honest who does not agree with the best opinion he promulgates.

In the case of Harlan, of Iowa, the Senate of the State did not want a Republican elected, and declined to attend the joint convention. In the case of Bright and Fitch, the Senate of the State did not want Democrats elected, and therefore declined to agree to a joint convention, or attend one.

The Senate of the United States condemned the process in Harlan's case, and sustained that in the case of Bright and Fitch.

They were inconsistent; but what of that? The editor of the Journal has no right to find fault. The Senators of the United States had two years to change opinions. The editor changes in an hour; and in the same article, speaking of the Republican Senate of Indiana refusing to go into an election, he says:

"The alleged tergiversation with which the (Republican) charges these Senators, was that they would not permit this newly-invented trick to cheat them out of their constitutional power to elect the electors. This most faithless in fact, matter was first following that they had repeatedly set them by the corrupt Democracy in Indiana and elsewhere."

Before he gets through he says:

"In the present days of the republic, according to the construction of the constitution, a Senate had the right to refuse an election, unless it were allowed a full and equal voice with the House in making the election. This right was initiated and acted upon by some of the States for twenty or thirty years after the adoption of the constitution, and many of the then wisest and purest men thought with Glasgow that such was the true construction. All this rant of Tompkins and Benjamin about the alleged tergiversation of the practice is a mere hypocritical sham, gotten up to cover the cowardly and mean motives of their own conduct, in speaking as they have done and voting to retain the privilege of having two Democratic Senators kept in their seats, in such plain violation of the constitution."

So these Senators of Iowa and Indiana had a constitutional discretion; yet the corrupt Democracy had set bad examples. If they have this constitutional discretion, then the motive being good or bad, is a matter for individual Senators. If they believe that evils of great magnitude will result from the election of a particular man to the Senate, they are justifiable to use a constitutional discretion to prevent it. It may be a high mark in favor of a man.

We have waited to see if the fire-eating press would tolerate Senator Hammond, of South Carolina. Nobody has said such wicked things of Leconte; no one has given it as contemptuous a "kick," as is not Hammond an Abolitionist? Must he not be read out of the party? Shall Douglas excite all the virulent insinuations of patriots, and will they place before the Senate from South Carolina? We do not think the patriots should make him of an inch of earth; it might lead to the suspicion that their pick was giving way, or that they never had much. So far, instead of denouncing the sinner in suitable terms, he is actually applauded. This is shocking. Even the Washington Union is silent. What has become of the fires of patriotism that blazed so against Douglas, and threatened to burn up all opposition? Are they extinct? What is to become of the country?

The question, "Ought Kansas to have come into the Union under the Leconte constitution?" was debated before the Debating Association of the Law Department of the Louisville University, at R. H. Wagner's, of Davis county, in the affirmative, and Robert Hamilton, of Louisville, in the negative. Mr. Higby, of Missouri, decided the question in the affirmative.

The people of Kansas, who are alone competent to decide in this case, have decided in the negative. It is too late after their decision to take the affirmative, unless we hold that a new State shall come into the Union, whether the people are willing or not.

The Baltimore Clipper, organ of the American party of Baltimore, perpetrates the following good joke:

"The city of New York presents, at this moment, a singular example of the sad effects of Democratic government."

JUDGE MUIR'S DECISION
In the Jailor Case.

THOMAS BAYMAN vs. JUDGE CARROLL, et al., Application for Habeas Corpus.

These causes were, by consent of parties, heard together. The facts were mainly agreed, and are substantially as follows, to-wit: On the second day of August, 1858, the judges were held for the offices of County Judge, County Clerk, Sheriff, Coroner, and Jailor. The former incumbents were the Hon. Thomas B. Bayman, John H. Hancock, and Richard Phillips, were candidates for the office of Jailor. The poll-books that Bayman received, 3,644 votes, that Hancock received 343 votes, and that Phillips received 53 votes. These numbers include the votes set down upon several pages of the poll-books, which were not signed by the clerk, the clerk, therefore, as directed by the State, if these pages are excluded from the count, then Bayman received 3,214 votes, and Hancock received 3,216. By the first vote of the judges, Bayman was elected, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
Harney, Hughes & Co.

READING MATTER ON EVERY PAGE.

TUESDAY.....NOV. 16, 1858.

The editor of the Journal is much excited about the election of Senators in Indiana. He writes a column and more himself, and then gives the authority of Jack Hale to help him out. We apprehend the editor had better examine the subject, before he undertakes to instruct his readers. He assumes that the Legislature must prescribe by law the mode, time, and place, of electing a United States Senator. This not having been done in Indiana, the election is invalid, the editor thinks. Now, it is not uncommon for the two houses of a State Legislature to pass a joint resolution fixing the time and place, and proceed to the election accordingly, without any law on the subject. All such elections have been invalid, according to the Journal. We have a law on the subject in this State; but our Know-Nothing Senate did not deem it, and the editor of the Journal justified them in this disregard of the law. We believe he told his readers that the law was only directory, and might be observed or not, at the discretion of either house. The editor had, therefore, better look into the subject a little further, and also recollect his own antecedents. He is not bound to be consistent. At any rate, he can't be expected to be so, judging from his past history; but it would look better; unless he avows his change of opinion.

We hold that a law prescribing the time, place, and manner of electing Senators, is proper enough; and, where there is one, it ought to be observed scrupulously; but it is not necessary to a valid election, if uniform practice is to count anything. The States have departed from a strict construction of the federal constitution on this subject; and upon what construction they will settle down at last, it is not easy to foresee. It appears to us that the Senate of the United States has decided opposite ways, in the two last cases that came before that body. Honorable Senators changed their opinions, perhaps, and it is not unlikely they may change again, at the first opportunity. The editor of the Journal cannot blame them for that; considering that he takes the liberty of changing whenever it suits him; and being dogmatic on both sides, holding that nobody can possibly be honest who does not agree with the best opinion he promulgates.

In the case of Harlan, of Iowa, the Senate of the State did not want a Republican elected, and declined to attend the joint convention. In the case of Bright and Fitch, the Senate of the State did not want Democrats elected, and therefore declined to agree to a joint convention, or attend one.

The Senate of the United States condemned the process in Harlan's case, and sustained that in the case of Bright and Fitch.

They were inconsistent; but what of that? The editor of the Journal has no right to find fault. The Senators of the United States had two years to change opinions. The editor changes in an hour; and in the same article, speaking of the Republican Senate of Indiana refusing to go into an election, he says:

"The alleged tergiversation with which the (Republican) charges these Senators, was that they would not permit this newly-invented trick to cheat them out of their constitutional power to elect the electors. This most faithless in fact, matter was first following that they had repeatedly set them by the corrupt Democracy in Indiana and elsewhere."

Before he gets through he says:

"In the present days of the republic, according to the construction of the constitution, a Senate had the right to refuse an election, unless it were allowed a full and equal voice with the House in making the election. This right was initiated and acted upon by some of the States for twenty or thirty years after the adoption of the constitution, and many of the then wisest and purest men thought with Glasgow that such was the true construction. All this rant of Tompkins and Benjamin about the alleged tergiversation of the practice is a mere hypocritical sham, gotten up to cover the cowardly and mean motives of their own conduct, in speaking as they have done and voting to retain the privilege of having two Democratic Senators kept in their seats, in such plain violation of the constitution."

So these Senators of Iowa and Indiana had a constitutional discretion; yet the corrupt Democracy had set bad examples. If they have this constitutional discretion, then the motive being good or bad, is a matter for individual Senators. If they believe that evils of great magnitude will result from the election of a particular man to the Senate, they are justifiable to use a constitutional discretion to prevent it. It may be a high mark in favor of a man.

We have waited to see if the fire-eating press would tolerate Senator Hammond, of South Carolina. Nobody has said such wicked things of Leconte; no one has given it as contemptuous a "kick," as is not Hammond an Abolitionist? Must he not be read out of the party? Shall Douglas excite all the virulent insinuations of patriots, and will they place before the Senate from South Carolina? We do not think the patriots should make him of an inch of earth; it might lead to the suspicion that their pick was giving way, or that they never had much. So far, instead of denouncing the sinner in suitable terms, he is actually applauded. This is shocking. Even the Washington Union is silent. What has become of the fires of patriotism that blazed so against Douglas, and threatened to burn up all opposition? Are they extinct? What is to become of the country?

The question, "Ought Kansas to have come into the Union under the Leconte constitution?" was debated before the Debating Association of the Law Department of the Louisville University, at R. H. Wagner's, of Davis county, in the affirmative, and Robert Hamilton, of Louisville, in the negative. Mr. Higby, of Missouri, decided the question in the affirmative.

The people of Kansas, who are alone competent to decide in this case, have decided in the negative. It is too late after their decision to take the affirmative, unless we hold that a new State shall come into the Union, whether the people are willing or not.

The Baltimore Clipper, organ of the American party of Baltimore, perpetrates the following good joke:

"The city of New York presents, at this moment, a singular example of the sad effects of Democratic government."

JUDGE MUIR'S DECISION
In the Jailor Case.

THOMAS BAYMAN vs. JUDGE CARROLL, et al., Application for Habeas Corpus.

These causes were, by consent of parties, heard together. The facts were mainly agreed, and are substantially as follows, to-wit: On the second day of August, 1858, the judges were held for the offices of County Judge, County Clerk, Sheriff, Coroner, and Jailor. The former incumbents were the Hon. Thomas B. Bayman, John H. Hancock, and Richard Phillips, were candidates for the office of Jailor. The poll-books that Bayman received, 3,644 votes, that Hancock received 343 votes, and that Phillips received 53 votes. These numbers include the votes set down upon several pages of the poll-books, which were not signed by the clerk, the clerk, therefore, as directed by the State, if these pages are excluded from the count, then Bayman received 3,214 votes, and Hancock received 3,216. By the first vote of the judges, Bayman was elected, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected. The former County Judge was defeated, and the defendant, Hancock, elected in the County Court, and Coroner were re-elected.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
Harney, Hughes & Co.

READING MATTER ON EVERY PAGE.

TUESDAY.....NOV. 16, 1858.

The editor of the Journal is much excited about the election of Senators in Indiana. He writes a column and more himself, and then gives the authority of Jack Hale to help him out. We apprehend the editor had better examine the subject, before he undertakes to instruct his readers. He assumes that the Legislature must prescribe by law the mode, time, and place, of electing a United States Senator. This not having been done in Indiana, the election is invalid, the editor thinks. Now, it is not uncommon for the two houses of a State Legislature to pass a joint resolution fixing the time and place, and proceed to the election accordingly, without any law on the subject. All such elections have been invalid, according to the Journal. We have a law on the subject in this State; but our Know-Nothing Senate did not deem it, and the editor of the Journal justified them in this disregard of the law. We believe he told his readers that the law was only directory, and might be observed or not, at the discretion of either house. The editor had, therefore, better look into the subject a little further, and also recollect his own antecedents. He is not bound to be consistent. At any rate, he can't be expected to be so, judging from his past history; but it would look better; unless he avows his change of opinion.

We hold that a law prescribing the time, place, and manner of electing Senators, is proper enough; and, where there is one, it ought to be observed scrupulously; but it is not necessary to a valid election, if uniform practice is to count anything. The States have departed from a strict construction of the federal constitution on this subject; and upon what construction they will settle down at last, it is not easy to foresee. It appears to us that the Senate of the United States has decided opposite ways, in the two last cases that came before that body. Honorable Senators changed their opinions, perhaps, and it is not unlikely they may change again, at the first opportunity. The editor of the Journal cannot blame them for that; considering that he takes the liberty of changing whenever it suits him; and being dogmatic on both sides, holding that nobody can possibly be honest who does not agree with the best opinion he promulgates.

In the case of Harlan, of Iowa, the Senate of the State did not want a Republican elected, and declined to attend the joint convention. In the case of Bright and Fitch, the Senate of the State did not want Democrats elected, and therefore declined to agree to a joint convention, or attend one.

The Senate of the United States condemned the process in Harlan's case, and sustained that in the case of Bright and Fitch.

They were inconsistent; but what

TELEGRAPH NEWS.

Foreign News.

NEW YORK, Nov. 16.—The steamship Prince Albert arrived on the 15th.

London, Nov. 15.—The sale of cotton on the 14th was quiet. The price of cotton on the 14th was 10 1/2 cents per pound.

London, Nov. 15.—The market is unchanged.

RUSS.

The market in this city is dull, both buyers and sellers holding off.

London, Nov. 15.—The market is unchanged.

London, Nov. 15.—The market is unchanged.

London, Nov. 15.—The market is unchanged.

River Intelligence.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

At 11 o'clock last night, a fire broke out in an old brick building, situated within the square bounded by Second, Third, and Water streets and Washington alley, and used as a warehouse for tobacco; it was formerly occupied as a tobacco-cutting-house, and occupied by Herbert & Wright as a mill-stone factory. In the building were stored a few hundred pounds of tobacco, we could not learn how many, nor to whom they belonged; these were not damaged except by water. The floors and roof of the house were destroyed, but the walls remain. The amount of damage cannot be much as the building was old and but a shell; the fire was not the work of an incendiary, but was speedily extinguished.

LOUISVILLE AND PORTLAND RAILROAD LINE. The omnibuses of this line hereafter run to Wheel street, every fifteen minutes. Fare, for any distance on "bus alone, invariably five cents; on "bus and car conjointly, ten cents. The "bus will not start until the fair is deposited in the box. The driver is not allowed to receive or deposit the fare, under any circumstances, from in or outside passengers. Passengers depositing ten cents will receive a car check from the driver.

To prevent delays, passengers will please, as far as practicable, provide themselves with "car fare" before entering the "bus. The patronage of the public is earnestly solicited for the portion of the line above Brook street, as upon them is dependent its success, and consequently its continuance.

City and country buyers are notified that Messrs. S. G. Henry & Co. have a large sale of desirable winter dry goods, at ten o'clock this morning, Thursday, at auction rooms. At eleven o'clock, an invoice of winter goods—gents and ladies—with a small invoice of ladies' new style round shawls will be sold. At twelve o'clock, and with the special attention of clothing and furnishing merchants is called, a lot of heavy winter business and overcoats, with an entire and fresh line of superior merino and all wool underwear will be sold.

We have by mail the December number of Arthur's Home Magazine; it is an excellent number and the book is worth to any family more than twice its price.

Frank Madden has received No. 3 of Gleason's new Weekly; it is destined to take the place of some of the trashy papers.

Paddock's Bank Mirror for November 15, is to hand.

Musical Fund Society.—The first public concert of the season will be given by the Musical Fund Society next Tuesday evening. Our readers all remember the excellent concert of last season, and will hail with delight the announcement we have made.

Frank Carl, alias Peter Porter, was arrested in this city yesterday, by one of the kidnapping watchmen, for robbing the Pearl House, in Jeffersonville, and handed over to an officer from that city. Carl is an old penitentiary bird, having, we understand, just served his time out in the Indiana Penitentiary.

THE MINSTRELS.—The Minstrels had a very large audience last evening, and gave unquestioned pleasure, not only by their singing, but dancing, and the dramatic scenes. The excellent jig, by Ritter, was an admirable piece of foot-work, and elicited warm applause. The Minstrels give another concert this evening, with a change of programme. We expect to see another full house.

The well loaded forty story brick warehouse and lot on Main street, now occupied by Messrs. Guirike & Co., was sold at public auction on Saturday last, by Messrs. S. G. Henry & Co. for \$25,000. Mr. J. M. Duncan was the purchaser; the brick smoke and packing house on Washington street, for \$9,200. The terms were 1/4 cash, balance in one, two, and three years interest.

The rehearsal of the Mozart Society was very well attended last evening, and three new members were elected. Now that something like settled weather has come, we expect to see these rehearsals fully attended.

After dark last night, the clouds cleared away, the wind went down, and the moon shone out beautifully. At midnight there was considerable ice formed.

JALES CASE.—A great many items of interest are crowded out, owing to the length of Judge Miller's decision in the case of Batman vs. Thomas, which will be found in another column. The decision was given against Mr. Batman.

We were visited by a pretty smart snow storm yesterday. But about one o'clock the weather cleared up, and it turned cool.

Mr. Jas. B. McGraw, who was injured on Thursday evening, at Richmond Ind., died about 6 o'clock Friday morning. He leaves a widow, and a son some 8 or 9 years old, and a daughter by a former wife.

The N. Y. Post says a Connecticut doctor has offered to sell Mayor Tilden a recipe for driving the cholera out of New York, for \$1000. It can be accomplished for less money.

SPARKS.—Everybody else sparks here at this season of the year, and Messrs. Duffield & Co., advertise that they are ready to furnish them to the community.

Remember that buckwheat cakes, lightened with Harley's Quick Yeast, are indeed a luxury, and no mistake.

"STAR CANDLES."—We have reduced their price one cent per pound on the different weights. Terms four months, as usual.

CORNWALL & BROTHER.

Heavy Hogs.—Messrs. Huffman, Duncan & Co., slaughtered yesterday, a lot of five hundred hogs, averaging two hundred and fifty-seven pounds net.

Clerks that can speak Chinese are in great demand by merchants in Paris. Every Chinese in the nation there, and chopsticks are used in the restaurants.

The New York tax-payers have held a meeting, and are about to try to correct their municipal affairs.

It is said that the Hon. Joseph Howe, of Nova Scotia, will succeed Sir E. W. Head as Governor General of British North America.

Hogs are coming in freely, and most of the pork-houses are in operation.

There are few offerings of hogs, but demand is good. The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

At Lafayette, Indiana, contracts have been extensively entered into at \$1.00, and the slaughter already commenced. Large quantities of fat hogs are passing daily over the Indiana railroads on their way East.

At Terre Haute, Indiana, but few hogs have been brought as yet, and the prospects are bad for a brisk business here. Buyers are offering \$5 per hundred, but holders are not disposed to sell at that rate. There will be fewer hogs packed there this season than last.

In Livingston county, Alabama, says the Athens News, several engagements have been made at 4-cents and a good many buyers are holding back, thinking that the market may yet settle down to 3-cents. In Wilson county, Alabama, a large number of hogs were made up this season, in place of the 10,000 which in the ordinary crop. The cholera has destroyed nearly every pig of the 10-cents. A like fatality has prevailed in the opposite region of Illinois.

At Kokon, \$1 continued to be the leading rate at latest advice. The financial Messenger of the 11th inst. has the following:

The packers in this city are making preparations for the winter season. The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

The market is quiet, and prices are steady. The market is quiet, and prices are steady.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

THE GREAT VICTORY REGULATOR, TRIESTE.

